

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Christopher Anderson	Team: Squad #11	CCRB Case #: 201902612	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Saturday, 11/24/2018 6:15 PM	Location of Incident: inside the 106th Precinct stationhouse	Precinct: 106	18 Mo. SOL 5/24/2020	EO SOL 1/8/2021	
Date/Time CV Reported Mon, 02/11/2019 1:26 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: In-person	Date/Time Received at CCRB Mon, 02/11/2019 1:26 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. SGT Darren King	01199	927032	106 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Kevin Lavelle	11350	961880	106 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.SGT Darren King	Abuse: Sergeant Darren King did not process § 87(2)(b) s complaint regarding officers.	[REDACTED]

Case Summary

On February 11, 2019, § 87(2)(b) appeared at the CCRB for an interview for CCRB case § 87(2)(b) after which he filed this complaint.

On November 24, 2018, at approximately 6:15 p.m., § 87(2)(b) went to the 106th Precinct stationhouse with the intent of filing a complaint against officers. When he did so, he spoke with Sgt. Darren King of the 106th Precinct, who did not process his complaint (**Allegation A -Abuse of Authority: Refusal to process civilian complaint,** § 87(2)(g) § 87(2)(g)

No video footage was obtained in this case.

§ 87(2)(b) was not arrested or issued a summons as a result of this incident.

This case was originally assigned to Inv. Andrew Ridge and was reassigned to the undersigned investigator on May 10, 2019.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Darren King did not process § 87(2)(b)'s complaint regarding officers.

§ 87(2)(b) stated to the CCRB (Board Review 01) that in the 106th Precinct stationhouse, he spoke, weeping, with Sgt. King and informed him of his complaint details. Sgt. King told § 87(2)(b) that there was a telephone number that he could call to complain about the incident. § 87(2)(b) requested the number of Sgt. King, who told him something to effect of his being able to “Google the number.” Sgt. King did not provide § 87(2)(b) with the telephone number, did not provide him with any paperwork to file a complaint, and did not provide him with any additional information about how to file a complaint.

Sgt. King stated to the CCRB (Board Review 02) that he had no independent recollection of § 87(2)(b) or this incident and, when presented with a photograph of § 87(2)(b) and a variety of alleged incident details, that none of these aided in his recollection of any interaction he had with him.

Sgt. King stated that in the general procedure when a civilian in the stationhouse wishes to file a complaint against an officer, he would interview the civilian to determine what occurred, ask whether they would prefer to file the complaint at that moment, provide them with a copy of the Civilian Complaint form, provide them with the options of filing the complaint at any stationhouse, with IAB, with the CCRB, or with 311, and provide them with information regarding the CCRB. Should the civilian wish to file the complaint at that time, Sgt. King would have the Telephone Switchboard (T/S) Operator assist the civilian in populating the form, receive the form, make an entry in the Command Log, place the complaint's log number on the form, and notify IAB and the CCRB.

When informed that § 87(2)(b) alleged that he requested a telephone number of Sgt. King through which he could file a complaint and that Sgt. King instructed him to “Google a number,” Sgt. King stated that this did not occur.

PO Lavelle, who was assigned as the Assistant Desk Officer at the time of this incident, stated to the CCRB (Board Review 03) that he had no independent recollection of § 87(2)(b) or this incident and, when presented with a photograph of § 87(2)(b) and a variety of alleged incident details, that none of these aided in his recollection of any interaction involving § 87(2)(b) and Sgt. King.

The 106th Precinct Command Log for the incident date (Board Review 07) contains an entry at 3:00 p.m. noting that Sgt. King took over the desk. The following entry noting a

supervisor taking over the desk was made at 11:05 p.m. Sgt. King made no entries seemingly relevant to this incident during the intervening period.

§ 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b) has been party to two CCRB complaints and has been named as a victim in six allegations (Board Review 04):
 - § 87(2)(b)
 -
- Sgt. King has been a member-of-service for 18 years and has been a subject in 15 CRB complaints and 49 allegations, 5 of which were substantiated:
 - 200310040 involved a substantiated allegation of discourteous word. The Board recommended Charges, and the NYPD imposed Instructions.
 - 200410783 involved substantiated allegations of retaliatory arrest and refusal to obtain medical treatment. The Board recommended Charges, and the NYPD imposed Command Discipline A.
 - 201000840 involved substantiated allegations of stop and frisk. The Board recommended Charges, and the NYPD imposed Command Discipline B.
 - § 87(2)(g)

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- This complaint was not suitable for mediation.
- On July 22, 2019, a Notice of Claim inquiry was sent to the New York City Office of the Comptroller, and the results will be added to the case file upon receipt (Board Review 05).
- [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

Squad No.: _____

Investigator: _____
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Squad Leader: _____
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Reviewer: _____
Signature Print Title & Name Date